1 (Case called)

2.3

THE CLERK: Plaintiffs ready?

MR. WEIGEL: Yes, your Honor. Robert Weigel from Gibson Dunn & Crutcher for the plaintiffs: Gucci America, Balanciaga, Balanciaga America, Bodega Veneta, Botega Veneta, Inc., Yves Saint Laurent America, Luxury Goods International, and Kering S.A.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. And with you is?

MR. WEIGEL: Ms. Anne Coyle.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to you both.

On behalf of certain defendants?

MR. RICH: Good afternoon, your Honor. Bruce Rich from Weil Gotshal. We are representing the defendants who are not involved in the immediate motion. The remaining Alibaba defendants and Alipay we are representing, and there will be a development with respect to that that Mr. Weigel and I would like to address to the Court at the right moment.

THE COURT: Mr. Weigel, is this the right moment?

MR. WEIGEL: It is. I am pleased, I guess, to say

that we have had some constructive dialogue with the folks from

Alibaba. We have not heard anything from the counterfeiters

themselves. We would like to file a notice of voluntary

dismissal as to t Alibaba defendants to give us time to see if

we can negotiate a resolution. It will be without prejudice.

If we cannot, we would like to be able to refile and perhaps

refer it to your Honor as a related case.

2.3

THE COURT: Is that the understanding, Mr. Rich?

MR. RICH: It is. We have been working pretty much around the clock the last 48 hours to get a set of principles acceptable to both sides. Needless to say, our client feels there is an important other side to the story. All that will be known, when we get to that in a moment, is the pleading. But we are very pleased to be able to put it back in a posture where the parties can talk seriously at the business level and

THE COURT: That all sounds wonderful to me. I will be pleased to sign off on anything that you need my signature on. Although, if it is a voluntary dismissal, you may not even need my signature on it.

MR. WEIGEL: I don't think we do, but I have a courtesy copy for you.

hopefully avert any reinstitution of the litigation.

THE COURT: That's wonderful.

MR. WEIGEL: May I approach?

THE COURT: You may. If you would like, I will so order it and have it caused to be docketed as such.

MR. WEIGEL: Thank you, your Honor.

The other thing is that we originally filed the action under seal in order to give us time to serve the counterfeiters and to freeze their assets in collection with Mr. Rich's clients. We would ask that that sealing order be lifted at

E7 Case 1:14-cv-05119-PKC Document 20 Filed 08/06/14 Page 4 of 8

1 | this point in time.

2.3

THE COURT: That's fine. Do you happen to have an order of some sort that I could sign for you?

MR. WEIGEL: Actually, we don't, but I will get one to you this afternoon.

THE COURT: That's fine. It doesn't have to be very elaborate. If you could do that, fax it to my chambers, and I would be delighted to enter that.

MR. WEIGEL: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Let's turn to the matter at hand, the motion for preliminary injunction directed to the merchant defendants. Would you be so kind to tell me, with regard to service of process, where you are.

MR. WEIGEL: There are 19 of the merchant defendants. We have served all but two of them, pursuant to the terms of your Honor's order, either by email or by posting on their store a link to a secure site that had a link, that had all the pleadings there. We understand that all of the sites are now down.

We got email back from five of the stores saying things from apologizing, asking to not take further action, asking for mercy, asking what this is all about. We have been telling all of them that they have been sued in New York and they should get an attorney. None of them filed any opposition.

THE COURT: Who are the two who have not been served?

MR. WEIGEL: Spring Rain Leather goods, and I

apologize for the pronunciation here, Xiaohui Jin's Store.

THE COURT: Thank you.

2.3

MR. WEIGEL: And I have a certificate of service which I will file with the clerk, unless your Honor would like it.

THE COURT: I would appreciate your doing that. That is fine. I have been through your papers. Is there anything else you want to say in support of your motion?

MR. WEIGEL: I think we set it out that we meet all the standards, your Honor. We have jurisdiction over these counterfeiters. We have a likelihood of success on the merits. Irreparable harm in the circumstances is pretty much presumed due to the difficulties in measuring the actual damages. There is no hardship enjoining them from selling fake stuff. We, of course, would be harmed and the public interest in our favor because the U.S. has a very strong interest in enforcing its trademark laws.

All of these defendants are either in English marketing to North America or, in the case of the defendants that were in Chinese, they all sold to our investigator. Some delivered, some didn't, but they all took our money and agreed to deliver to New York.

THE COURT: This is the Court's statement of reasons for the grant of a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs

2.3

claim that the merchant defendants are manufacturing, importing, exporting, distributing, marketing, advertising, offering for sale, and/or selling goods bearing counterfeit reproductions of plaintiffs' federally registered trademarks, trade names, and/or logos which are owned and controlled by plaintiffs.

The items at issue are Gucci bags, cosmetic bags, watches, wallets, shoes, leather for Gucci bags, belts, and shoes, Bodega Veneta wallets, Balanciaga sandals, and Yves Saint Laurent T-shirts.

The claims asserted, at least on the preliminary injunction motion, are trademark infringement, trademark counterfeiting, trademark dilution, trademark infringement under New York law, unfair competition under New York law, trademark dilution under New York law, deceptive acts and practices under New York law.

To prevail on trademark counterfeit claims, plaintiff must prove that the names are entitled to protection and that there is a likelihood of confusion between the merchant defendants counterfeited products and plaintiffs' products. Plaintiffs' marks are valid and are entitled to protection. The federal trademark registration is prima facie evidence of the validity of the marks.

Here further I find that plaintiff has shown that the senior mark is famous, the senior mark is distinctive. The

E7 Case 1:14-cv-05119-PKC Document 20 Filed 08/06/14 Page 7 of 8

junior counterfeiting commercial use in commerce began after the senior mark became famous, and there will be dilution because of the distinctive quality of the senior mark.

With regard to irreparable harm, I don't rely on a presumption. I find that there is evidence in this record of the likelihood of loss of good will and loss of control over the brand's reputation.

A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant by a clear showing carries the burden of persuasion. A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must show irreparable harm and either a likelihood of success on the merits or serious questions going to the merits to be a fair ground for litigation, a balance of the hardships tipping decidedly towards the party requesting the preliminary relief, and also that public policy considerations may not be offended.

Here I find that the standards for a preliminary injunction are fully satisfied, and I grant the motion as to all defendants except the Alibaba defendants, who have now been dismissed without prejudice from the action, and also excepting the two defendants who have not yet been served, Spring Rain Leather Goods and Xiaohui Jin's Store. Further, I find that a preliminary injunction bond in the amount of \$10,000 is most adequate, reasonable, and appropriate under the situation.

I will invite plaintiffs' counsel to submit a proposed